Interview Summary	Application No. 10/074,030	Applicant(s) APPLIN ET AL.
	Examiner Tuan A. Vu	Art Unit 2193

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) *Tuan A. Vu*.   (3)_____.

(2) *Steve Perry*.   (4)_____.

Date of Interview: *4/20/06; 4/28/06*.

Type: a)☒ Telephonic   b)☐ Video Conference
          c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant   2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes   e)☒ No.
    If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: *1*.

Identification of prior art discussed: *n/a*.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☒ was reached.   g)☐ was not reached.   h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: *See Continuation Sheet*.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

_____
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative has been approached during the weeks of 4/20 and 4/28 to the effect that some features deemed important to the novelty aspect of the invention need to be put forth in the independent claims. Accordingly, Examiner had particularly pointed out this feature as to be a source program construct which turns into a executable object at runtime with methods operable specifically for checking version of object files, when such version information has been predetermined at preprocessing time and made available for the object method to use at runtime. The representative has agreed to put this into the claim, hence has provided sufficient improvement to the claimed subject matter as proposed above; and this would enable the examiner to place the application in better condition for allowance..